

Serial No. 09/805,755

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. In response to the final office action, applicants have amended claims 7-9, 12, 14, and 15. Claims 1-15 remain pending for reconsideration.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for allowing claims 1-6.

Claims 7-10 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,417,864 (Jones). Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,124,695 (Green). Applicants have amended the claims to clarify the claim language and obviate the rejections.

Specifically, the office action relied on an unreasonably broad interpretation of the term 'about' to sustain the rejection. Applicants disagree with the office action's interpretation of the term, but for business reasons not related to patentability have amended the claims to advance the prosecution.

Applicants have changed the term 'about' to 'substantially' in claims 7-9, 12, 14 and 15. Merriam-Webster's Dictionary (ninth edition) defines substantially as being largely but not wholly that which is specified. Applicants submit that this amendment does not raise any new issues because the previously used term 'about' read properly in light of the specification clearly referred to ratios and widths which were equal to or very nearly equal to the specified quantities. The term 'substantially' merely clarifies this relationship.

With respect to claims 7 and 12, one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that Jones' ratio of 2:1 does not teach or suggest the recited light output ratio of substantially 1:1. Accordingly, claims 7 and 12, and their respective dependent claims are patentable over Jones.

With respect to claim 8, one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that the pulses TD1 and TD2 in Jones do not teach or suggest the recited first pulse and second pulse being of substantially equal width.

P10038

5

Serial No. 09/805,755

With respect to claims 9, 14 and 15, one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that the pulses TD16 and TD1 in Jones do not teach or suggest the recited a third pulse being substantially twice the width of the first pulse.

With respect to claim 11, Green, which is relied on for other aspects, fails to make up for the above-noted deficiencies in Jones. Accordingly, claim 11 is patentable over Jones in view of Green.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested. Early notification of the same is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

April 15, 2005

Date

/Paul E. Steiner/
Reg. No. 41,326
(703) 633 - 6830

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(503) 684-6200

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at:

Fax No.: 703-872-9306

Signature

Rachael Brown

Date

P10038

6